

# **AB 32 and the California Petroleum Refinery Sector**

## **Greenhouse Gas Reporting Technical Discussion**



**July 17, 2007  
Sacramento**

# Agenda

- Review of reporting basics
- Refinery Reporting Regulation Methodologies
  - Regulatory Concepts Paper
- Exploration and Production Sector Reporting
- Co-Generation Update
- Verification Update
- CCAR/URS Discussion Paper

# Proposed Reporting Basics

- Annual reporting and verification on a facility basis
- Stationary combustion, process, fugitives
- Purchased energy usage (steam/heat, electricity)
- No mobile source requirements
- Gases as specified in the regulation
  - CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, HFCs

# Defining Facility Boundaries

- Sources of GHGs on contiguous or adjacent properties
- Common operational control
- Within single two-digit SIC code?
- Exceptions for production facilities?
  - Often not contiguous or adjacent
  - Define facility according to air district permit?

# Regulation to Specify

- Core GHG data verification requirements
- Accreditation requirements for verifiers
- Conflict-of-interest limitations
- ARB oversight



# Refinery Reporting Regulation Methodologies



# Stationary Combustion – CO<sub>2</sub>

- Refinery Fuel Gas
  - HHV – hourly or hourly average
  - CC – daily
  - Calculate a fuel specific EF
    - $EF = CC/HHV$
    - Use EF and hourly HHV to calculate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions
- Natural Gas
  - HHV weekly w/ EF
  - CC monthly (calculate and report EF)

# Process Emissions – Hydrogen Plants

$$E_{\text{CO}_2} = \text{FSR} \times \text{CF} \times 44/12$$

FSR = feedstock supply rate

CF= carbon fraction in feedstock

44/12 = carbon to CO<sub>2</sub> conversion

Natural Gas – CC weekly

RFG, naphtha – CC daily



# Hydrogen Plant – Process Emissions

Calculation of CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions Using the  
Hydrogen Production Rate Emissions

Two Issues = Limited Applicability

- 1). RFG feedstock – H<sub>2</sub> introduced with no associated emission = overestimation
- 2). H<sub>2</sub> recycled as fuel with PSA tail gas = underestimation

# Asphalt Production

- Uncontrolled emissions – EPA EF  
2,555 scf CH<sub>4</sub>/Mbbbl
- Flaring – AQMD emissions reporting data
- Uncontrolled Storage Tanks – EPA TANKS

# Fugitive Emissions

- Wastewater
  - IPCC methodology
- Storage Tanks
  - Uncontrolled tanks – EPA TANKS
- Process Vents
  - API methodology
- Flaring
  - AQMD reporting data – NHMC composition?

# Oil Production Sources

- Subject to reporting as a major source under the 25,000 metric ton threshold
  - Combustion sources only
  - Process, fugitives may be added later
- Methods and fuel sampling requirements would be similar to refinery sector
  - Associated gas also highly variable
- Cogeneration emissions allocation also would be specified in the regulation
  - Facility-specific efficiency values



# Cogeneration: Emissions Allocation



# Cogeneration: Emissions Allocation

- Registry Efficiency Allocation
  - Preferred Approach
  - Based on Actual Efficiencies
    - Thermal energy and electricity production
- Desire to be more specific
  - Topping Cycle Plants
    - Electric generation is at the top or beginning of the cycle and other thermal energy streams sent to processes after electricity production
  - Bottoming Cycle Plants
    - Recovers steam or heat from a process stream to produce electricity.

## Registry Efficiency Method: GHG Emissions Allocation

Thermal Energy	Electricity
$E_H = \frac{H/e_H}{H/e_H + P/e_P} \times E_T$	$E_P = E_T - E_H$

### Where:

- $E_H$  = Emissions allocated to steam production
- $H$  = Total steam (or heat) output (MMBtu)
- $e_H$  = Efficiency of steam (or heat) production
- $P$  = Total electricity output (MMBtu)
- $e_P$  = Efficiency of electricity generation
- $E_T$  = Total direct emissions of the CHP System
- $E_P$  = Emissions allocated to electricity production



# **Cogeneration: Emissions Allocation**

- Consulting with CCC and CAC/EPUC
- Facility-Specific Efficiencies
- May Schedule Additional Meeting to Discuss



# Verification: Initial Concepts



# Verification: Initial Proposal

- Require annual third-party verification for refineries, utilities, and power plants and co-generation facilities selling power to the grid or other users
- Require triennial third-party verification for cement plants and other stationary combustion sources  $\geq 25,000$  tons CO<sub>2</sub>
- Require annual third-party verification for anyone entering a future market

# Third Party Verification

- All verifiers to be trained under ARB approved curriculum
  - Demonstrated expertise
  - Consistency in verification
  - Will have sector specific training
    - Refineries
    - Utilities
    - Cement

# Verification Activities

- Identify sources and review data management systems
- Focus on most significant and uncertain sources
  - Uncertainty risk based sampling of estimates
- Differences exceeding 5 percent considered significant
- Detailed, confidential verification report to facility and ARB



# **Reporting and Verification Timing Proposal**

- Power and cogeneration plants without additional facility sources or purchases to report
  - Emissions reports due by April 30
  - Verification complete by Aug 31
- Utilities, refineries, cement plants and other stationary combustion sources
  - Emissions reports due by Aug 31
  - Verification complete by December 31

# Conflict of Interest

## ■ Term Limit

- Verifiers to be changed after 6 years of conducting verification activities
- Allowed to resume with client after 1 year off cycle for verification

## ■ Conflict of Interest Policy

- Must agree not to act on behalf of reporting facility as both consultant and verifier concurrently or within any 3 year period
- Modeled after CEC guidance for CCAR

# Accreditation

- ARB to specify requirements necessary to become verifier
- Propose following fairly stringent international and CCAR approaches
- Only an accredited firm may present a verification report.
  - Firm must have at least two lead verifiers

# Verification Oversight

- ARB staff responsible for enforcing regulation
- Verification process will assist efforts to assure compliance
- Targeted review of submitted data and verifiers



# Steps Ahead

- Share initial draft regulatory language
- Public workshop August 15
- Additional meetings with stakeholders
- Staff report and staff regulatory proposal by October 19
- Board hearing December 6 or 7

# ARB Contacts

**Richard Bode – Chief  
Emissions Inventory Branch  
*rbode@arb.ca.gov*  
(916) 323-8413**

**Doug Thompson – Manager  
Climate Change Reporting Section  
*dthompson@arb.ca.gov*  
(916) 322-7062**

**Webster Tasat - Manager  
Emissions Inventory Analysis Section  
*wtasat@arb.ca.gov*  
(916) 323-4950**





# **Contacts**

## **Emissions Reporting**

**Byard Mosher – Refinery Reporting Lead**  
***bmosher@arb.ca.gov***  
**(916) 323-1185**

**Dana Papke – Cogeneration Reporting Lead**  
***dpapke@arb.ca.gov***  
**(916) 323-2308**

**Rajinder Sahota – Verification and General Reporting Lead**  
***rsahota@arb.ca.gov***  
**(916) 323-8503**

***[www.arb.ca.gov/cc/cc.htm](http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/cc.htm)***



# **CCAR Discussion Paper**

## **Discussion Paper for a Petroleum Refining Greenhouse Gas Accounting and Reporting Protocol**

Mike McCormick, California Climate Action Registry  
Lisa Campbell, URS Corporation